

Appln. No. 09/276,233
Response filed May 15, 2006
replying to Office Communication of Mar. 15, 2006

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 7451.0011-01
Intertrust Ref. No.: IT-17 (US)

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In reply to the Office Communication mailed March 15, 2006, notifying Applicants that the reply filed in December 2005 was not fully responsive, Applicants respectfully request that the Office enter the amendments set forth above and consider the following remarks. This paper is fully responsive to the prior Office Action, mailed July 1, 2005. By this response, Applicants amend claim 1, cancel claim 26 without prejudice or disclaimer, and add new claims 27-44. Claim 1 is amended to recite means for managing access to, or use of, said content in accordance with said control information. Support for the amendment can be found in the Specification at, e.g., page 15. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 22, and 27-44 are pending in this application.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the basis for the present Communication, and note that the present claims are submitted without any associated disclaimer of subject matter. Further, Applicants interpret the present Office Action to indicate that the papers submitted December 7, 2005, and December 29, 2005, have not been entered. (See, e.g., MPEP § 821.03.) Accordingly, Applicants make the present submissions in view of this interpretation.

Regarding the substance of the Office Action mailed July 1, 2005, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication, "Performance Study of a Selective Encryption Scheme for the Security of Networked, Real-Time Video," by Spanos et al. ("Spanos"), in view of the publication, "Applied Cryptography," by Schneier ("Schneier"); (ii) rejected claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos and Schneier in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,303 to Huizer et al. ("Huizer"); (iii) rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

Appln. No. 09/276,233
Response filed May 15, 2006
replying to Office Communication of Mar. 15, 2006

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 7451.0011-01
Intertrust Ref. No.: IT-17 (US)

being unpatentable over Spanos and Schneier in view of U.S. Patent No 5,694,332 to Maturi ("Maturi"); (iv) rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos and Schneier in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,649,233 to Bass et al ("Bass"); and (v) rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos in view of publication "How Plug-Ins 'Plug In,'" by Mark Brown ("Brown"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,038 to Stutz et al. ("Stutz"). These rejections are traversed respectfully in view of the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 22 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos.

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos and Schneier in view of Huizer.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos and Schneier in view of Maturi.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos and Schneier in view of Bass.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanos in view of Brown and in further view of Stutz.

Each of claims 1-7 and 22 includes the limitation of means for managing access to, or use of, said content in accordance with said control information. This limitation is not shown or suggested by the cited prior art references, either alone or in combination.

More specifically, the Applicants respectfully note that Spanos describes Aegis, a

Appln. No. 09/276,233
Response filed May 15, 2006
replying to Office Communication of Mar. 15, 2006

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 7451.0011-01
Intertrust Ref. No.: IT-17 (US)

data encryption protocol that "limits the amount of data to be encrypted or decrypted by using video compression to reduce the size of transmitted video images." Spanos at 1. Thus, Spanos does not show or suggest means for managing access to, or use of, said content in accordance with said control information.

Schneier does not resolve Spanos' deficiencies, as Schneier only describes the particular encryption algorithm (DES) used by Aegis and key operations. Office Action mailed 1 July 2005, at 4-5.

Huizer does not resolve these deficiencies, as that reference discloses demultiplexing signals. *Id.* at 6.

Bass does not resolve these deficiencies, as Bass discloses only a method for authenticating nodes and users by constructing keys for user sessions. *Id.* at 8.

Maturi does not resolve these deficiencies, as Maturi discloses only a method for processing MPEG-encoded data streams. *Id.* at 9.

Thus, the cited art, alone or in combination, does not show or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1-7, and 22. The Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 26, Applicants have canceled claim 26 without prejudice or disclaimer in order to expedite prosecution of the remaining claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 26 is now moot.

New Claims

Applicants submit that new claims 27-44 raise no new issues and are allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Specifically, new claims 27-44 are dependent

Appln. No. 09/276,233
Response filed May 15, 2006
replying to Office Communication of Mar. 15, 2006

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 7451.0011-01
Intertrust Ref. No.: IT-17 (US)

claims that recite subject matter already before the Examiner (e.g., derived from existing dependent claims), and thus present no new matter and require no additional search. Additionally, all of the new claims directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of new claims 27-44.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 15, 2006

By: _____


Andrew B. Schwaab
Reg. No. 38,611

Finnegan Henderson Farabow
Garrett & Dunner L.L.P.
901 New York Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Attorney direct (650) 849-6643